Enhanced entanglement of two different mechanical resonators via coherent feedback

Jie Li[1,2], Gang Li[1], Stefano Zippilli[2], David Vitali[2], and Tiancai Zhang[1]
[1]*State Key Laboratory of Quantum Optics and Quantum Optics Devices, Institute of Opto-Electronics, Shanxi University, Taiyuan 030006, China*
[2]*School of Science and Technology, Physics Division, University of Camerino, via Madonna delle Carceri, 9, I-62032 Camerino (MC), Italy, and INFN, Sezione di Perugia, Italy*
(Dated: October 25, 2016)

It is shown [New J. Phys. 17, 103037 (2015)] that extremely large and robust entanglement between two different mechanical resonators could be achieved, either dynamically or in the steady state, in an optomechanical system in which a single cavity mode driven by a suitably chosen two-tone field is coupled to two mechanical modes. The main limitation of the scheme is that the cavity decay rate must be much smaller than the two mechanical frequencies and their difference, allowing taking the rotating wave approximation where counter-rotating, non-resonant terms associated with the bichromatic driving are negligible. Here we show that, by simply adding a coherent feedback loop, the large entanglement can be remarkably enhanced and the effective cavity decay rate can be significantly reduced. Therefore, it improves the results of Ref. [New J. Phys. 17, 103037 (2015)] and meantime greatly extends the validity of the scheme.

PACS numbers: 42.50.Lc, 42.50.Ex, 42.50.Wk, 85.85.+j

arXiv:1610.07261v1 [quant-ph] 24 Oct 2016

I. INTRODUCTION

Entangled states of macroscopic objects, especially of *massive* objects, are vital for the study of the quantum-to-classical transition [1, 2], wave-function collapse theories [3–5] and gravitational quantum physics [6]. However, entanglement between massive objects is hard to prepare since large-scale objects are more affected by various environmental noises and have also stronger internal interactions. Besides, gravitationally induced decoherence [7] may also play its role in degrading the superposition and entanglement of massive objects. Recently, it has been shown that self-gravity of a macroscopic mechanical object may affect the quantum dynamics of its center-of-mass motion [8, 9], and, as a result, it may affect the entanglement of the motional states of two or more large objects.

At the mesoscopic/macroscopic level, entanglement has been demonstrated in various systems: e.g., in two atomic ensembles [10], in two Josephson-junction qubits [11, 12], and in an electro-mechanical system [13]. However, entanglement between two mechanical resonators (MRs) has been demonstrated only at the microscopic level, in the case of two trapped ions [14], and between two single-phonon excitations in nanodiamonds [15]. Optomechanics, addressing the coupling of optical and mechanical degrees of freedom via radiation pressure, provides an ideal platform to prepare quantum states in mechanical systems [16]. Many schemes have been put forward for the generation of entanglement between two MRs utilizing optomechanical and/or electromechanical systems: e.g., by exploiting radiation pressure [17–20], the squeezing of optical field [21, 22], the conditional measurements on light modes [23–28], mechanical nonlinearities [29] and parametric driving [30]. Recently, reservoir engineering ideas [31–35] have been applied to optomechanical scenarios by exploiting properly chosen multi-frequency drivings. In such a way, large and robust entanglement between two MRs could be achieved either dynamically or in the steady state [36–44]. Similar ideas have been used to generate entangled pairs of MRs in a harmonic chain [45] and cluster states of a large number of MRs [46].

In this paper, we aim to further improve the results obtained in the scheme [42] by introducing a coherent feedback loop [47–52]. Differently from the conventional measurement based feedback [53–56], the non-measurement based, hence backaction free, coherent feedback shows advantages in many aspects: e.g., in cooling [57] and suppressing noises [58] of MRs, in squeezing optical field [59–64], in entangling optical modes [65–67] and quantum nodes [68], in engineering nonlinear effects [69], and so on. However, up to now, to the best of our knowledge, it has not been studied how such a feedback affects the entanglement of two macroscopic MRs, which is exactly the theme of this paper.

The scheme [42] shares similarity with the one provided in [39]. However, the former is believed more compact and experimental friendly in the sense that a four-tone driving is not required for the most general case of *unequal* single-photon optomechanical couplings [39]. The protocol [42] optimally works in a rotating wave approximation (RWA) regime where counter-rotating, non-resonant terms associated with the bichromatic driving are negligible, which requries that the cavity decay rate κ is much smaller than the two mechanical frequencies $\omega_{1,2}$ and their difference $|\omega_1 - \omega_2|$, i.e., $\kappa \ll \omega_{1,2}, |\omega_1 - \omega_2|$. This may limit the applications of the scheme [42] because typically the frequency of mechanical systems is not large. We show that by including coherent feedback, in which a portion of the cavity output field is returned to the input port, the effective cavity decay rate can be significantly reduced and the entanglement can be largely enhanced, and hence the condition for taking the RWA in Ref. [42] is greatly relaxed, extending largely the validity of the protocol. The feedback loop contains a controllable beamsplitter (CBS) [60, 61, 64, 65] which adjusts, by altering its reflectivity, how much of the output light is sent back into the input port. This is important for the generation of entanglement because there exist optimal values, depending on specific system parameters, of the reflectivity of the CBS and of the ratio



FIG. 1: Sketch of the proposed entanglement generation and coherent feedback loop. The cavity mode is bichromatically driven at the two frequencies $\omega_0+\omega_1$ and $\omega_0-\omega_2$. Large and robust entanglement between the two MRs can be generated either dynamically or in the steady state. The output field of the cavity is fed back into the input port through highly reflective mirrors (HRM) and a controllable beamsplitter (CBS) with tunable reflection coefficient r_B. $a_0^{\rm in}$ and $a_2^{\rm in}$ denote vacuum noises entering into the system through the CBS and the output cavity mirror, respectively.

of two effective optomechanical couplings $G_{1,2}$, which yield maxima of the entanglement. We show that both steady-state and dynamical entanglement, achieved respectively for $G_1 \neq G_2$ and $G_1 = G_2$ [42], can be remarkably enhanced. This is more notable for the dynamic case and for the system at low environmental thermal excitations.

The paper is organized as follows. In Section II we first provide the system Hamiltonian and its corresponding quantum Langevin equations (QLEs) without coherent feedback. We then include the feedback loop and derive the modified QLEs, from which one sees clearly the effects of the feedback, which make it possible to largely improve the entanglement of the two MRs. In Section III, we present the results and compare the entanglement between the two MRs in the two cases with and without coherent feedback. It shows that remarkable improvement of the entanglement could be achieved by the feedback in both of the dynamic and steady state cases. We also study the effect of the light phase shift in the feedback loop on the entanglement. Finally, we make our conclusions in Section IV.

II. SYSTEM HAMILTONIAN AND LANGEVIN EQUATIONS WITH COHERENT FEEDBACK

As depicted in Fig. 1, we consider an optical cavity mode with resonance frequency ω_c which is bichromatically driven at the two frequencies $\omega_0+\omega_1$ and $\omega_0-\omega_2$, with the reference frequency ω_0 detuned from the cavity resonance by $\Delta_0 = \omega_c - \omega_0$. The cavity mode is interacting via optomechanical interaction with two different MRs with frequencies ω_1 and ω_2. The system Hamiltonian, in a reference frame rotating at the frequency ω_0, is given by

$$\hat{H} = \hbar\Delta_0\hat{a}^\dagger\hat{a} + \hbar\sum_{j=1}^{2}\omega_j\hat{b}_j^\dagger\hat{b}_j + \hbar\sum_{j=1}^{2}g_j\hat{a}^\dagger\hat{a}\left(\hat{b}_j+\hat{b}_j^\dagger\right) + \hbar\left[\left(E_1e^{-i\omega_1 t}+E_2e^{i\omega_2 t}\right)\hat{a}^\dagger + \text{H.C.}\right], \quad (1)$$

where $\hat{a}$ and $\hat{b}_{1,2}$ are the annihilation operators of the cavity mode and the mechanical modes, respectively, and g_j is the single-photon optomechanical coupling to the j-th MR. This means that the cavity mode is simultaneously driven on the blue sideband associated with the MR with frequency ω_1, and on the red sideband associated with the MR with frequency ω_2.

Since the cavity is strongly pumped, the system dynamics can be effectively studied by linearizing the optomechanical interaction. In this case, the average fields for both the cavity, $\alpha(t)$, and the mechanical degrees of freedom, $\beta_j(t)$, are large, and one can simplify the interaction Hamiltonian at the lowest order in the field fluctuations $\delta\hat{a}(t) = \hat{a}(t)-\alpha(t)$ and $\delta\hat{b}_j(t) = \hat{b}_j(t)-\beta_j(t)$. Differently from the typical optomechanical systems in which the steady state average fields are time-independent, here the bichromatic driving induces a time-dependent, periodic steady state average field which, in turn, implies time-dependent effective coupling strengths for the linearized dynamics of the fluctuations [42].

In what follows, we first provide the QLEs for the case without considering coherent feedback, and we then add the coherent feedback loop and write the modified QLEs. By comparing the two sets of the QLEs, we will see clearly the effects of the feedback, which results in an improvement of the entanglement. The QLEs including noise terms without feedback, in the interaction picture with respect to the Hamiltonian $\hat{H}_0 = \hbar\sum_{j=1}^{2}\omega_j\hat{b}_j^\dagger\hat{b}_j$, are given by [42]

$$\delta\dot{\hat{a}} = -(\kappa_1+\kappa_2+i\Delta)\delta\hat{a} - iG_1\delta\hat{b}_1^\dagger - iG_2\delta\hat{b}_2 + \sum_{i=1}^{2}\sqrt{2\kappa_i}\hat{a}_i^{\rm in} \quad (2)$$

$$\delta\dot{\hat{b}}_1 = -\frac{\gamma_1}{2}\delta\hat{b}_1 - iG_1\delta\hat{a}^\dagger + \sqrt{\gamma_1}\hat{b}_1^{\rm in}, \quad (3)$$

$$\delta\dot{\hat{b}}_2 = -\frac{\gamma_2}{2}\delta\hat{b}_2 - iG_2^*\delta\hat{a} + \sqrt{\gamma_2}\hat{b}_2^{\rm in}, \quad (4)$$

where κ_1 and κ_2 are, respectively, the cavity decay rates due to the transmission through the two cavity mirrors, γ_1 and γ_2 are the damping rates of the two mechanical modes, and G_1 and G_2 are the (generally complex) effective optomechanical couplings, expressed as

$$G_1 = \frac{g_1E_1}{\omega_1-\Delta+i(\kappa_1+\kappa_2)}, \qquad G_2 = \frac{g_2E_2}{-\omega_2-\Delta+i(\kappa_1+\kappa_2)}. \quad (5)$$

$\hat{a}_i^{\rm in}$ ($\hat{b}_j^{\rm in}$) are the input noise operators (in the case with feedabck, $\hat{a}_1^{\rm in}$ in turn becomes the input field operator for the cavity) associated with the cavity mode (mechanical modes), whose only nonzero correlation functions are $\left\langle\hat{a}_i^{\rm in}(t)\,\hat{a}_i^{\rm in}(t')^\dagger\right\rangle = \delta(t-t')$, $\left\langle\hat{b}_j^{\rm in}(t)\,\hat{b}_j^{\rm in}(t')^\dagger\right\rangle = (\bar{n}_j+1)\delta(t-t')$ and



FIG. 2: (a)-(c) Time evolution of the entanglement between the two MRs, with (solid lines) and without (dashed lines) coherent feedback, starting from an initial separated state with the optical mode fluctuations in the vacuum state and each MR in its thermal state with mean phonon number: (a) $\bar{n}_1 = \bar{n}_2 = 0$, $G_1 = 0.995G_2$ without feedback; $|r_B| = 0.95$ and $G_1 = 0.9989G_2$ with feedback. (b) $\bar{n}_1 = 200$, $\bar{n}_2 = 100$, $G_1 = 0.918G_2$ without feedback; $|r_B| = 0.7$ and $G_1 = 0.953G_2$ with feedback. (c) $\bar{n}_1 = 2000$, $\bar{n}_2 = 1000$, $G_1 = 0.75G_2$ without feedback; $|r_B| = 0.4$ and $G_1 = 0.8G_2$ with feedback. (d) Optimal steady-state entanglement (by adjusting G_1/G_2) as a function of $|r_B|$. The other parameters are as in (b). In all plots, we have taken $\gamma_1 = \gamma_2 = 10$ Hz, $G_2 = 2\kappa = 10^5$ Hz, $\Delta = 0$ and $\theta = 2n\pi$ ($n = 0, 1, 2, ...$).

$\left\langle \hat{b}_j^{\rm in}(t)^\dagger \hat{b}_j^{\rm in}(t')\right\rangle = \bar{n}_j\delta(t-t')$, with $\bar{n}_j = \left[\exp\left(\hbar\omega_j/k_BT\right) - 1\right]^{-1}$ the mean thermal phonon number of the j-th MR, which is assumed to stay at the same environmental temperature T. Δ is the effective cavity detuning which includes the frequency shift induced by the optomechanical interaction, proportional to the DC component of the average mechanical oscillation amplitude $\beta_j(t)$ (see Appendix B in Ref. [42]). The above QLEs are derived by neglecting the non-resonant time-dependent terms of the effective linearized interactions, which is justified when

$$\kappa,\ \left|g_j\,\frac{E_j}{\omega_j}\right| \ll \omega_j, |\omega_1 - \omega_2|\,. \tag{6}$$

In practice $\left|g_j\,\frac{E_j}{\omega_j}\right| \ll \omega_j, |\omega_1 - \omega_2|$ can be easily satisfied by lowering the power of the lasers. However, κ cannot take very small values bounded by the finesse of the cavity, which limits the applications of the scheme [42].

Nevertheless, as we will show below, by including a coherent feedback loop (green lines in Fig.1) the effective cavity decay rate can be significantly reduced and therefore the condition $\kappa \ll \omega_j, |\omega_1 - \omega_2|$ is greatly relaxed. The feedback loop is straightforward and it sends the output field of the cavity through a CBS (with tunable reflectivity) back into the input port. We shall work in the limit of instantaneous feedback, which is a very good approximation since in optomechanical systems, typically the mechanical frequency is not large. Considering a 5 cm cavity with a 10 cm feedback loop, the delay time is $\sim 10^{-10}$ s, which is much smaller than a period of mechanical oscillation, e.g. 10^{-7} s with frequency 10 MHz. Therefore, the effect of time delay in the feedback loop on the mechanical modes could be safely neglected. The output field is obtained using the standard input-output formula [70]

$$\hat{a}^{\rm out} = \sqrt{2\kappa_2}\hat{a} - \hat{a}_2^{\rm in}. \tag{7}$$

The cavity output is then sent into one input port of the CBS with vacuum entering into the other input port, and thus one of the output field operator of the CBS, which in turn becomes the input field operator for the cavity, is obtained

$$\hat{a}_1^{\rm in} = r_B\,\hat{a}^{\rm out} + t_B\,\hat{a}_0^{\rm in}, \tag{8}$$

where r_B and t_B are the (generally complex) reflection and transmission coefficients, $|r_B|^2 + |t_B|^2 = 1$ for a BS without absorption, and $\hat{a}_0^{\rm in}$ is the vacuum noise operator, which has only a nonzero correlation function $\left\langle \hat{a}_0^{\rm in}(t)\,\hat{a}_0^{\rm in}(t')^\dagger\right\rangle = \delta(t-t')$. It should be noted that, in writing Eq. (8) we have included all the possible losses (e.g. due to the transmission of the highly reflective mirrors) and phase shift (due to the reflection and propagation) of the light in the feedback loop into

the complex reflection coefficient of the CBS, $r_B = |r_B|e^{i\theta}$. In other words, here $|r_B|$ is interpreted as the real reflection coefficient of the CBS minus additional losses in the feedback loop, which means that in Eq. (8) $|r_B|$ cannot take unity, but only approaches it, $0 \leq |r_B| < 1$. Inserting Eqs. (7) and (8) into Eq. (2), we obtain the modified QLE for the cavity mode, which is

$$\delta\dot{\hat{a}} = -(\kappa_1 + \kappa_2 - 2\sqrt{\kappa_1\kappa_2}\, e^{i\theta}|r_B| + i\Delta)\delta\hat{a} - iG_1\delta\hat{b}_1^\dagger - iG_2\delta\hat{b}_2 + (\sqrt{2\kappa_2} - \sqrt{2\kappa_1}e^{i\theta}|r_B|)\,\hat{a}_2^{\rm in} + \sqrt{2\kappa_1}t_B\,\hat{a}_0^{\rm in}. \tag{9}$$

It takes a simpler form when the two decay rates $\kappa_{1,2}$ are assumed equal, $\kappa_1 = \kappa_2 \equiv \kappa$, given by

$$\delta\dot{\hat{a}} = -[2\kappa(1-|r_B|\cos\theta) + i(\Delta - 2\kappa|r_B|\sin\theta)]\delta\hat{a} - iG_1\delta\hat{b}_1^\dagger - iG_2\delta\hat{b}_2 + \sqrt{2\kappa}(1-e^{i\theta}|r_B|)\,\hat{a}_2^{\rm in} + \sqrt{2\kappa}t_B\,\hat{a}_0^{\rm in}. \tag{10}$$

By comparing with the equation (2) without feedback, we see that due to the coherent feedback the cavity decay rate can be significantly reduced, $2\kappa \to 2\kappa(1-|r_B|\cos\theta)$, when $|r_B| \to 1$ and $\theta = 2n\pi$ (n=0, 1, 2, ...), and the effective detuning is also modified, $\Delta \to \Delta - 2\kappa|r_B|\sin\theta$. Moreover, the vacuum noises entering into the cavity can be deeply suppressed. This is clearly seen by looking at the correlation function of the combined noise operator $\hat{A}^{\rm in} = \sqrt{2\kappa}(1-e^{i\theta}|r_B|)\,\hat{a}_2^{\rm in} + \sqrt{2\kappa}t_B\,\hat{a}_0^{\rm in}$,

$$\left\langle \hat{A}^{\rm in}(t)\hat{A}^{\rm in\dagger}(t')\right\rangle = D_{\rm vac}\,\delta(t-t'), \tag{11}$$

where $D_{\rm vac} = 4\kappa(1-|r_B|\cos\theta)$ is the diffusion rate associated with the vacuum noises. We see that the diffusion rate is also significantly reduced when $|r_B| \to 1$ and $\theta = 2n\pi$. The above two facts make it possible to improve remarkably the entanglement between the two MRs. However, it is not true that for the generation of entanglement one should consider the reflectivity of the CBS as large as possible. As we will show later, there is an optimal value of the reflectivity r_B, depending on system parameters (especially on thermal noises), which gives rise to the maximum entanglement.

III. ENTANGLEMENT BETWEEN THE TWO MRS WITH AND WITHOUT COHERENT FEEDBACK

In Figs. 2 and 3, we present the results, with and without coherent feedback, of the entanglement between the two MRs for the following two cases: Fig. 2 for unequal couplings $G_1 < G_2$ leading to steady-state entanglement, and Fig. 3 for equal couplings $G_1 = G_2$ giving dynamic entanglement. The entanglement is calculated by means of the logarithmic negativity [71] based on the covariance matrix of quadratures of the two mechanical modes, which is obtained by solving the QLEs (3), (4) and (10) (see the Appendix for obtaining the covariance matrix and logarithmic negativity). For the first case, we see that with coherent feedback the entanglement generates faster and reaches the steady state value on a much shorter time scale. The steady state value is moderately enhanced, compared to the case without feedback, e.g, by 25%, 17%, 20% in the three sets of parameters in Fig. 2 (a), (b), (c), respectively. This is a remarkable improvement since the value without feedback is already large. Note that the values of $|r_B|$ and G_1/G_2 that have been employed in Fig. 2 (a)-(c) are the optimal values for achieving maxima of the entanglement in the steady state. It shows that as the thermal noises increase the optimal values of $|r_B|$ and G_1/G_2 become smaller. For the system at the same temperature, the optimal value of G_1/G_2 with feedback is larger than that without feedback. This is because a reduced cavity decay rate results in a larger cooperativity $C_1 = G_1^2/\kappa\gamma$, which correspondingly gives rise to larger optimal entanglement achieved at larger G_1/G_2 [42]. In Fig. 2 (d), we plot the optimal entanglement (optimized over G_1/G_2) as a function of $|r_B|$. It is clear that an optimal value of $|r_B|$ exists corresponding to the maximum entanglement. Similar finding has been observed in the study of coherent feedback effects on the entanglement of optical fields [65].

The stability condition is quite involved in the general case, but it takes a simple form for the case of equal mechanical



FIG. 3: (a) Time evolution of the mechanical entanglement E_N, with (dots) and without (dashed line) coherent feedback, in the case of equal couplings $G_1 = G_2 \equiv G$. Each dot corresponds to an evolution up to that time with a fixed optimal r_B of the BS, so that each dot denotes a different experiment. (b) The corresponding optimal values of $|r_B|$ for the entanglement as a function of time. The parameters are $\gamma_1 = \gamma_2 = 10$ Hz, $G = 2\kappa = 10^5$ Hz, $\bar{n}_1 = 200$, $\bar{n}_2 = 100$, $\Delta = 0$ and $\theta = 2n\pi$ ($n = 0, 1, 2, ...$).

dampings, $\gamma_1 = \gamma_2 = \gamma$, which is

$$|G_2|^2 > |G_1|^2 - (1 - |r_B| \cos\theta)\kappa\gamma\left\{1 + \frac{4\tilde{\Delta}^2}{[\gamma + 4\kappa(1 - |r_B| \cos\theta)]^2}\right\}, \quad (12)$$

where $\tilde{\Delta} = \Delta - 2\kappa|r_B|\sin\theta$ is the effective detuning modified by the feedback. Eq. (12) guarantees that all the eigenvalues associated with the linearized dynamics of Eqs. (3), (4) and (10) have negative real parts, i.e., the system is stable. It is found that $\tilde{\Delta} = 0$ is the optimal detuning for the generation of entanglement between the two MRs. In this case, the stability condition becomes $|G_2|^2 > |G_1|^2 - (1 - |r_B| \cos\theta)\kappa\gamma$. We note that in general coherent feedback has little effect on the stability of the system. Actually, if $|G_2| > |G_1|$ is fulfilled, the system remains stable no matter the values of $|r_B|$ and θ.

The improvement by coherent feedback is more notable in the dynamic case: e.g., the maximum of the entanglement increases by 83% in Fig. 3 (a). Each dot in Fig. 3 (a) corresponds to a system evolution up to that time with a fixed optimal r_B of the BS (the corresponding optimal values of r_B are reported in Fig. 3 (b)), so that each dot denotes a different experiment. It shows that as the entanglement evolves the optimal value of $|r_B|$ for it decreases. This is consistent with the results found in the steady state case in the sense that as the entanglement evolves it is subjected to more external noises leading to a decreasing optimal value of $|r_B|$. For verifying the entanglement in transient time, one could consider exploiting the technique of pulsed optomechanics [72] and sending two weak pulsed probe beams following the detection scheme provided in [42]. Differently from [42], here the output of the probe modes are collected and measured from the transmission of the CBS. From the above two cases, we see that it is true that larger reflectivity of the CBS is better for reducing the cavity decay rate and also vacuum noises into the system, but for the sake of entanglement, the feedback loop containing a BS with *tunable* reflectivity is vital for achieving large entanglement of the two MRs.



FIG. 4: Effect of the phase shift in the feedback loop on the steady-state entanglement between the two MRs. $\theta \in [0, 2\pi]$. The parameters are as in Fig. 2 (b) with coherent feedback.

A. Effect of the phase shift in the feedback loop on the entanglement

Figs. 2 and 3 are plotted with the specific phase shift of the light in the feedback loop $\theta = 2n\pi$ ($n = 0, 1, 2, ...$). Given that the phase shift may have significant effects on the entanglement, a careful study of a more general case is needed. In Fig. 4, we plot the entanglement as a function of θ in one period, $\theta \in [0, 2\pi]$. It shows that the entanglement is particularly sensitive to the phase shift in the feedback loop and $\theta = 2n\pi$ is optimal for the entanglement, which is just the phase that has been considered in Figs. 2 and 3. On the contrary, the phase shift $\theta = (2n + 1)\pi$ yields a minimum of the entanglement, smaller than the value without feedback, which should be avoided. At this phase, the fed back light destructively interferes with the input light, the cavity decay rate is increased and the coherent feedback counteracts the creation of entanglement.

IV. CONCLUSIONS

We have studied the effects of coherent feedback on the improvement of entanglement between two MRs based on the scheme [42]. The feedback loop contains a CBS with tunable reflectivity which is the key for optimizing the entanglement. The coherent feedback results in a significantly reduced cavity decay rate when the reflectivity of the CBS is large and when the phase shift of the light in the feedback loop is properly chosen. As a result, the entanglement can be remarkably improved. Specifically we have observed that this effect is particularly evident in the dynamical case which is relevant to the pulsed experiment [13]. Moreover, we have shown that there exist optimal values of the reflectivity of the CBS for the entanglement. This implies that, in certain cases, it is actually desirable to have finite loss in the feedback loop. We have also analysed the effect of the phase shift in the feedback loop on the entanglement. The present work improves the results of Ref. [42] and the fact that a significantly reduced cavity decay rate due to coherent feedback greatly relaxes the condition of the scheme [42], making it able to be applied in more general situations.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

J. L. would like to thank M. Asjad and X.-J. Jia for useful discussions and Institute of Opto-Electronics, Shanxi University, for providing a visiting position. This work has been supported by the European Commission through the FET-Open Project iQUOEMS, and by the Major State Basic Research Development Program of China (Grant No. 2012CB921601) and the National Natural Science Foundation of China (Grant Nos: 11634008, 11674203, 91336107, 61227902).

APPENDIX

Here we briefly introduce the method we employ to determine the entanglement between the two MRs. The entanglement is calculated using the logarithmic negativity based on the covariance matrix of the two mechanical modes, which is obtained by solving the QLEs (3), (4) and (10). The QLEs can be rewritten in the following form

$$\dot{u}(t) = Au(t) + n(t), \tag{13}$$

where u is the vector of quadrature fluctuation operators of the two mechanical modes and one cavity mode, i.e., $u(t) = (\delta\hat{q}_1(t), \delta\hat{p}_1(t), \delta\hat{q}_2(t), \delta\hat{p}_2(t), \delta\hat{X}(t), \delta\hat{Y}(t))^{\mathrm{T}}$, with $\delta\hat{q}_j{=}(\delta\hat{b}_j{+}\delta\hat{b}_j^{\dagger})/\sqrt{2}$, $\delta\hat{p}_j{=}i(\delta\hat{b}_j^{\dagger}{-}\delta\hat{b}_j)/\sqrt{2}$ ($j{=}1,2$), and $\delta\hat{X}{=}(\delta\hat{a}{+}\delta\hat{a}^{\dagger})/\sqrt{2}$, $\delta\hat{Y}{=}i(\delta\hat{a}^{\dagger}{-}\delta\hat{a})/\sqrt{2}$. A is the so-called drift matrix, which takes the form of

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} -\frac{\gamma_1}{2} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -G_1 \\ 0 & -\frac{\gamma_1}{2} & 0 & 0 & -G_1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -\frac{\gamma_2}{2} & 0 & 0 & G_2 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -\frac{\gamma_2}{2} & -G_2 & 0 \\ 0 & -G_1 & 0 & G_2 & -2\kappa(1{-}|r_B|\cos\theta) & \tilde{\Delta} \\ -G_1 & 0 & -G_2 & 0 & -\tilde{\Delta} & -2\kappa(1{-}|r_B|\cos\theta) \end{pmatrix}, \tag{14}$$

where $\tilde{\Delta} = \Delta - 2\kappa|r_B|\sin\theta$ and $\tilde{\Delta} = 0$ is found the optimal detuning for the entanglement. The system is stable when all the eigenvalues of the drift matrix have negative real parts, which is equivalent to the condition (12) for the case of equal mechanical dampings $\gamma_1 = \gamma_2$. $n(t)$ is the vector of noise quadrature operators associated with the noise terms in the QLEs (3), (4) and (10). The formal solution of Eq. (13) is given by

$$u(t) = M(t)u(0) + \int_0^t ds\, M(s)n(t-s), \tag{15}$$

where $M(t) = e^{At}$. Therefore, the covariance matrix $V(t)$ of the system quadratures, with its entries defined as $V_{ij} = \frac{1}{2}\left\langle\{u_i, u_j\}\right\rangle$ ($\{\cdot,\cdot\}$ denotes an anticommutator), is obtained

$$V(t) = M(t)V(0)M(t)^{\mathrm{T}} + \int_0^t ds\, M(s)DM(s)^{\mathrm{T}}, \tag{16}$$

where $V(0)$ is the covariance matrix associated with the inital state of the system and D is the diffusion matrix, whose entry is defined as

$$\frac{1}{2}\left\langle n_i(t)n_j(s) + n_j(s)n_i(t)\right\rangle = D_{ij}\delta(t-s). \tag{17}$$

The diffusion matrix is a diagonal matrix which, for the QLEs (3), (4) and (10), is $D = \mathrm{diag}[\gamma_1(\bar{n}_1 + \frac{1}{2}), \gamma_1(\bar{n}_1 + \frac{1}{2}), \gamma_2(\bar{n}_2 + \frac{1}{2}), \gamma_2(\bar{n}_2 + \frac{1}{2}), 2\kappa(1{-}|r_B|\cos\theta), 2\kappa(1{-}|r_B|\cos\theta)]$.

Once the covariance matrix $V(t)$ is obtained, the entanglement can then be quantified using the logarithmic negativity [71]:

$$E_N(t) = \max[0, -\ln 2\tilde{\nu}_-(t)], \tag{18}$$

where $\tilde{\nu}_-(t) = \min\mathrm{eig}|i\Omega_2\tilde{V}_m(t)|$ ($\Omega_2{=}\oplus_{j=1}^{2}\, i\sigma_y$ the so-called symplectic matrix and σ_y the y-Pauli matrix) is the minimum symplectic eigenvalue of the covariance matrix $\tilde{V}_m(t) = \mathcal{P}V_m(t)\mathcal{P}$, with $V_m(t)$ the 4×4 covariance matrix related to the two mechanical modes and $\mathcal{P} = \mathrm{diag}(1,1,1,-1)$ the matrix that inverts the sign of momentum of the 2nd MR, i.e., $\delta\hat{p}_2 \to -\delta\hat{p}_2$, realizing partial transposition at the level of covariance matrices [73].

[1] A. J. Leggett, Prog. Theor. Phys. **69**, 80 (1980); J. Phys. Condens. Matter **14**, R415 (2002).
[2] W. H. Zurek, Phys. Today **44**, 36 (1991); W. H. Zurek, Rev. Mod. Phys. **75**, 715 (2003).
[3] A. Bassi, K. Lochan, S. Satin, T. P. Singh, and H. Ulbricht, Rev. Mod. Phys. **85**, 471 (2013).
[4] S. Belli, *et al.*, Phys. Rev. A **94**, 012108 (2016).
[5] J. Li, S. Zippilli, J. Zhang, and D. Vitali, arXiv:1508.00466v1.
[6] see e.g., New J. Phys. Focus issue on "Gravitational Quantum Physics", edited by M. Aspelmeyer, C. Brukner, D. Giulini, and G. Milburn.
[7] L. Diósi, Phys. Lett. A **120**, 377 (1987); Phys. Rev. A **40**, 1165 (1989); R. Penrose, Gen. Relativ. Gravit. **28**, 581 (1996).
[8] H. Yang, H. Miao, D.-S. Lee, B. Helou, and Y. Chen, Phys. Rev. Lett. **110**, 170401, (2013).
[9] J. Li, F. Marin, and D. Vitali, In preparation.
[10] B. Julsgaard, A. Kozhekin and E. S. Polzik, Nature **413**, 400 (2001).
[11] A. J. Berkley *et al.*, Science **300**, 1548 (2003).
[12] M. Steffen *et al.*, Science **313**, 1423 (2006).
[13] T. A. Palomaki, J. D. Teufel, R. W. Simmonds, and K. W. Lehnert, Science **342**, 710 (2013).
[14] J. D. Jost *et al.*, Nature **459**, 683 (2009).
[15] K. C. Lee *et al.*, Science **334**, 1253 (2011).
[16] M. Aspelmeyer, T. J. Kippenberg, and F. Marquardt, Rev. Mod. Phys. **86**, 1391 (2014).
[17] S. Mancini, V. Giovannetti, D. Vitali and P. Tombesi, Phys. Rev. Lett. **88**, 120401 (2002).
[18] D. Vitali, S. Mancini, and P. Tombesi, J. Phys. A: Math. Theor. **40**, 8055 (2007).
[19] C. Genes, D. Vitali, and P. Tombesi, New J. Phys. **10**, 095009 (2008).
[20] M. J. Hartmann and M. B. Plenio, Phys. Rev. Lett. **101**, 200503 (2008).
[21] J. Zhang, K. C. Peng, and S. L. Braunstein, Phys. Rev. A **68**, 013808(2003).
[22] M. Pinard, A. Dantan, D. Vitali, O. Arcizet, T. Briant and A. Heidmann, Europhys. Lett. **72**, 747 (2005).
[23] S. Pirandola, D. Vitali, P. Tombesi, S. Lloyd, Phys. Rev. Lett. **97**, 150403 (2006).

[24] K. Borkje, A. Nunnenkamp, and S. M. Girvin, Phys. Rev. Lett. **107**, 123601 (2011).

[25] M. Abdi, S. Pirandola, P. Tombesi, and D. Vitali, Phys. Rev. Lett. **109**, 143601 (2012).

[26] M. J. Woolley and A. A. Clerk, Phys. Rev. A **87**, 063846 (2013).

[27] M. Abdi, S. Pirandola, P. Tombesi, and D. Vitali, Phys. Rev. A **89**, 022331 (2014).

[28] H. Flayac and V. Savona, Phys. Rev. Lett. **113**, 143603 (2014).

[29] J. Robert Johansson, N. Lambert, I. Mahboob, H. Yamaguchi, and F. Nori, Phys. Rev. B **90**, 174307 (2014).

[30] A. Szorkovszky, A. A. Clerk, A. C. Doherty and W. P. Bowen, New J. Phys. **16**, 063043 (2014).

[31] J. Poyatos, J. I. Cirac, and P. Zoller, Phys. Rev. Lett. **77**, 4728 (1996).

[32] A. R. R. Carvalho, P. Milman, R. L. de Matos Filho, and L. Davidovich, Phys. Rev. Lett. **86**, 4988 (2001).

[33] S. Diehl, A. Micheli, A. Kantian, B. Kraus, H. P. Büchler, and P. Zoller, Nature Phys. **4**, 878 (2008).

[34] F. Verstraete, M. M. Wolf, and J. I. Cirac, Nature Phys. **5**, 633 (2009).

[35] S. Pielawa, L. Davidovich, D. Vitali, and G. Morigi, Phys. Rev. A **81**, 043802 (2010).

[36] Y.-D. Wang and A. A. Clerk, Phys. Rev. Lett. **108**, 153603 (2012).

[37] H. Tan, G. Li, and P. Meystre, Phys. Rev. A **87**, 033829 (2013).

[38] M. Schmidt, M. Ludwig, and F. Marquardt, New J. Phys. **14**, 125005 (2012).

[39] M. J. Woolley and A. A. Clerk, Phys. Rev. A **89**, 063805 (2014).

[40] M. Abdi, and M. J. Hartmann, New J. Phys. **17**, 013056 (2015).

[41] L. F. Buchmann and D. M. Stamper-Kurn, Phys. Rev. A **92**, 013851 (2015).

[42] J. Li, I. Moaddel Haghighi, N. Malossi, S. Zippilli, and D. Vitali, New J. Phys. **17**, 103037 (2015).

[43] C.-J. Yang, J.-H. An, W. Yang, and Y. Li, Phys. Rev. A **92**, 062311 (2015).

[44] M. Asjad, S. Zippilli, and D. Vitali, Phys. Rev. A **93**, 062307 (2016).

[45] S. Zippilli, J. Li, and D. Vitali, Phys. Rev. A **92**, 032319 (2015)

[46] O. Houhou, H. Aissaoui, and A. Ferraro, Phys. Rev. A **92**, 063843 (2015).

[47] H. M. Wiseman and G. J. Milburn, Phys. Rev. A **49**, 4110 (1994).

[48] S. Lloyd, Phys. Rev. A **62**, 022108, (2000); R. J. Nelson, Y. Weinstein, D. Cory, and S. Lloyd, Phys. Rev. Lett. **85**, 3045 (2000).

[49] H. Mabuchi, Phys. Rev. A **78**, 032323 (2008).

[50] M. R. James, H. I. Nurdin, and I. R. Petersen, IEEE Trans. Autom. Control **53**, 1787 (2008); J. E. Gough and M. R. James, IEEE Trans. Autom. Control **54**, 2530 (2009); H. I. Nurdin, M. R. James, and A. C. Doherty, SIAM J. Control Optim. **48**, 2686 (2009); H. I. Nurdin, M. R. James, and I. R. Petersen, Automatica **45**, 1837 (2009); J. E. Gough, M. R. James, and H. I. Nurdin, Phys. Rev. A **81**, 023804 (2010).

[51] K. Jacobs, X. Wang, and H. M. Wiseman, New J. Phys. **16**, 073036 (2014).

[52] N. Yamamoto, Phys. Rev. X **4**, 041029 (2014).

[53] H. M. Wiseman and G. J. Milburn, *Quantum Measurement and Control* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, England, 2010).

[54] H. M. Wiseman and G. J. Milburn, Phys. Rev. Lett. **70**, 548 (1993); H. M. Wiseman, Phys. Rev. A **49**, 2133 (1994).

[55] K. Jacobs, *Quantum Measurement Theory and its Applications* (Cambidge University Press, Cambridge, England, 2014).

[56] A. C. Doherty and K. Jacobs, Phys. Rev. A **60**, 2700 (1999); A. C. Doherty, S. Habib, K. Jacobs, H. Mabuchi, and S. M. Tan, Phys. Rev. A **62**, 012105 (2000).

[57] R. Hamerly and H. Mabuchi, Phys. Rev. Lett. **109**, 173602 (2012); Phys. Rev. A **87**, 013815 (2013).

[58] N. Yang *et al.*, Phys. Rev. A **92**, 033812 (2015).

[59] M. Yanagisawa and H. Kimura, IEEE Trans. Autom. Control **48**, 2121 (2003).

[60] J. E. Gough and S. Wildfeuer, Phys. Rev. A **80**, 042107 (2009).

[61] S. Iida, M. Yukawa, H. Yonezawa, N. Yamamoto, and A. Furusawa, IEEE Trans. Automat. Contr. **57**, 2045 (2012).

[62] O. Crisafulli, N. Tezak, D. B. S. Soh, M. A. Armen, and H. Mabuchi, Opt. Express **21**, 18371 (2013).

[63] M. Kraft, S. M. Hein, J. Lehnert, E. Schöll, S. Hughes, and A. Knorr, Phys. Rev. A **94**, 023806 (2016).

[64] N. Német and S. Parkins, Phys. Rev. A **94**, 023809 (2016).

[65] Z. H. Yan, X. J. Jia, C. D. Xie, and K. C. Peng, Phys. Rev. A **84**, 062304 (2011); Y. Y. Zhou, X. J. Jia, F. Li, J. Yu, C. D. Xie, and K. C. Peng, Sci. Rep. **5**, 11132 (2015).

[66] D. Wang, C. Xia, Q. Wang, Y. Wu, F. Liu, Y. Zhang, and M. Xiao, Phys. Rev. B **91**, 121406(R) (2015).

[67] Z. Shi and H. I. Nurdin, Quantum Inf. Process **14**, 337 (2015).

[68] S. M. Hein, F. Schulze, A. Carmele, and A. Knorr, Phys. Rev. A **91**, 052321 (2015).

[69] J. Zhang, R. B. Wu, Y. X. Liu, C. W. Li, and T. J. Tarn, IEEE Trans. Automat. Contr. **57**, 1997 (2012).

[70] M. J. Collett and C. W. Gardiner, Phys. Rev. A **30**, 1386 (1984).

[71] J. Eisert, PhD Thesis, University of Potsdam, 2001; G. Vidal and R. F. Werner, Phys. Rev. A **65**, 032314 (2002); M. B. Plenio, Phys. Rev. Lett. **95**, 090503 (2005).

[72] M. R. Vanner, I. Pikovski, G. D. Cole, M. S. Kim, C. Brukner, K. Hammerer, G. J. Milburn, and M. Aspelmeyer, Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA **108**, 16182 (2011).

[73] R. Simon, Phys. Rev. Lett. **84** 2726 (2000).